



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/311,254	05/13/1999	JEFFREY P. LEE	10990419-1	9998

7590 10/29/2003

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
3404 E HARMONY ROAD
P.O. BOX 272400
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/311,254

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-8,11-14 and 17-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-8,11-14 and 17-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the request for reconsideration filed on 8/7/2003.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, and 17-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 5/13/99 have been approved by the draftsman.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, and 17-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney (Pat.# 5,999,664, 12/7/99, filed 11/14/97), in view of Venable (Pat.# 5,995,996, 11/30/99, filed 1/30/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Mahoney discloses a document analyzer for segmenting a document image into a set of layout objects—*number of regions*—and to determine

a predefined document feature--*data type*-- (col. 5, lines 44-50, col.13, L.34-67, and col.24, lines 20-67, fig.9, 969).

Moreover, Mahoney teaches a selection user interface for identifying set of features for search and further processing based upon a request by an application program—*destination application*-- selection request (col.8, lines 1-50, col.16, lines 47-col.17, line 67, col. 34, lines 1-67, fig.6, 9-10, 12-14). Mahoney fails to explicitly disclose: *identifying a processing pipeline to process each of the regions comprising one of the predefined data types selected in the selection interface, wherein the processing pipeline is identified to process each of the regions based upon the predefined data type of each of the regions, respectively, and based upon a predetermined destination application*. However, Venable teaches the invoking or identifying of a document processing pipeline for processing a document as selected by an application program (col.8, lines 46-col.9, line 67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mahoney, and Venable, and have identified the pipeline, because this would provide an efficient processing method of large data, such as that taught by Mahoney, and minimize the processing overhead as taught by Venable (col. 3, lines 62-col.4,line 67).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses toggle mechanisms for enabling a user to request desired features by selecting and deselecting operations (col.24, lines 50-67, fig.9, 969).

Claim 5 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the system found in claim 2, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses default selection configuration—"none"-- for enabling a user to request desired features (col.24, lines 50-67, fig.9, 969).

Claims 7-8, 11-12, and 19-20 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the system found in claims 1-6, 1, and 1 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 13-14, 17-18, and 21 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1-2, 2, 6, and 1 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 19, Mahoney teaches a selection user interface with selection elements for identifying set of features for search and further processing based upon a request by an application program selection request (col.8, lines 1-50, col.16, lines 47-col.17, line 67, col. 34, lines 1-67, fig.6, 9-10, 12-14). Mahoney fails to explicitly disclose: *digital document to be applied to a processing pipeline*. However, Venable teaches the invoking or identifying of a document processing pipeline for processing a document as selected by an application program (col.8, lines 46-col.9, line 67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mahoney, and Venable, and have identified the pipeline, because this would provide an efficient

processing method of large data, such as that taught by Mahoney, and minimize the processing overhead as taught by Venable (col. 3, lines 62-col.4,line 67).

Claim 23 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the system found in claim 22, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 24 is directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 22, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 8/7/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "different regions within a document that are made up of different data types and/or that are to be applied to different destination applications may be processed by different pipelines" page 3, lines 6-10) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Moreover, the Applicant states that Venable does not teach or suggest the identification of a processing pipeline as set forth in claim 1 (page 3,lines 11-28). The Examiner disagrees

with this statement, because Mahoney teaches a selection interface for selecting portions of a document based on the structural description layout objects or data types, and based upon the application or source of the requested document(s) (col. 7, lines 20-col.8, line 51). Mahoney fails to explicitly disclose: *identifying a processing pipeline to process each of the regions comprising one of the predefined data types selected in the selection interface, wherein the processing pipeline is identified to process each of the regions based upon the predefined data type of each of the regions, respectively, and based upon a predetermined destination application.* However, Venable teaches the invoking or identifying of document processing pipelines or functions—40A-C, fig.2--for processing a document as selected by an application program (col.8, lines 30-67); therefore, by calling the function by its function name—*pipeline id*—, a host application is able to process the requested data. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mahoney, and Venable, and have identified the pipeline, because this would provide an efficient processing method of large data, such as that taught by Mahoney, and minimize the processing overhead as taught by Venable (col. 3, lines 62-col.4, line 67).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "pipelines are not selected from among a number of possible pipelines" page 3, lines 33-34) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "Venable does not teach identifying a separate pipeline for each of the regions in a document") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pavey et al (Pat. # 5,530,907), and Maniwa (Pat. #. 5,764,866).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office


Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

10/15/03